



# Guide to Post Results Services

June 2019 series  
November 2019 series  
January 2020 series

## Contents

1. Introduction .....	3
2. Can I have a copy of a marked script before applying for a review of marking? .....	5
3. Who undertakes the reviews of marking or moderation and how are they monitored? ...	5
4. How is a review conducted?.....	6
5. What is a moderation or marking error? .....	7
6. How should applications be made and will WJEC accept applications for reviews of marking or moderation directly from candidates? .....	8
7. Where will review decision letters be sent and what information will be included? .....	8
8. Is there an appeals process? .....	9
9. Will WJEC undertake further investigation if there is a concern about the marking of a cohort?.....	9

## 1. Introduction

WJEC is committed to ensuring that all candidates' results are issued accurately on results day. We have quality assurance processes to ensure that results are accurate:

- We only recruit examiners and moderators who are qualified teachers with teaching experience in the subject they are marking or moderating
- Before marking/moderation starts, all examiners and moderators attend a standardisation conference, which is specific to the assessment(s) they are marking or moderating. They must successfully complete the standardisation process before starting to mark/moderate. During the standardisation process, senior examiners mark a set of candidates' papers. Examiners are then given these papers to mark and their marks are compared with those agreed by the senior examiners. If there are any differences, these are discussed. Examiners are not allowed to start marking until a senior examiner is satisfied that they can apply the mark scheme correctly
- Examiners and moderators do not have any conflict of interest with centres or candidates whose work they are marking or moderating
- We monitor each examiner's marking at least twice during the marking period. Action is taken if an examiner is not meeting the standard
- Each moderator is cross-moderated by a senior moderator. Action is taken if a moderator is not meeting the standard.

[Here](#) is a summary of our quality assurance process to ensure that each candidate's script is marked in line with the standard set by the Principal Examiner. Information on WJEC's Principles for assessing and awarding qualifications is available [here](#).

We realise, however, that errors can occur and we want to ensure that our post results services correct any errors in a timely manner. The services and deadlines are as follows:

- Service 1: A clerical re-check of a candidate's examination script
- Service 2: A review of marking of a candidate's examination script
- Service 2P: A priority review of marking of a candidate's examination script for GCE and other Level 3 qualifications only
- Service 3: A review of moderation, if we've changed centre marks during moderation (this service is not available for individual candidates)
- Access to scripts (see section 2 below)

Series	Results day	Deadline to request a priority script prior to Review of Marking*	Deadline to request a Review of Marking or Moderation	Deadline for requesting a script to support teaching and learning
June 2019 GCE/other Level 3 qualifications	15 August	22 August	19 September	26 September
June 2019 GCSE/other Level 1/2 qualifications	22 August	29 August	19 September	26 September
November 2019	16 January	23 January	13 February	20 February
January 2020	5 March	19 March	9 April	9 April

\*For the June 2019 series, we are piloting a free, unannotated scripts service for the following GCSE qualifications:

- WJEC English Language (3700U20-1 and 3700U30-1)
- WJEC Welsh Language (300N20-1 and 300N30-1)
- Eduqas English Language (C700U10-1 and C700U20-1)

Centres can download scripts on behalf of candidates from WJEC's secure website which also includes the instructions on this process. **Please note, that a centre must obtain the candidate's permission prior to downloading or applying for a script.** Scripts will be available to download from results day until the 19<sup>th</sup> September. **Please note that review of marking applications cannot be made after the deadline date of the 19<sup>th</sup> September.**

**Centres must obtain written consent from a candidate prior to submitting a request for a clerical re-check and review of marking as the candidate's mark and grade may go up, down or remain the same. The request cannot, under any circumstances, be cancelled once the outcome has been issued by WJEC. Candidate consent is not required for a review of moderation as the original grade will not be lowered.**

All our fees and application deadlines are published on our [website](#) prior to the start of each examination series.

The JCQ Post Results guide is available [here](#). WJEC follows the same JCQ procedures in January as for the June and November series.

## 2. Can I have a copy of a marked script before applying for a review of marking?

Yes, requests can be made but must be received by the deadline date. We will ensure that the script is available to the centre or private candidate no later than 2 weeks before the deadline date for submitting a review of marking request. The script will include examiner marks and annotations, as appropriate.

Applications for internal candidate scripts should be made by centres using the WJEC secure website. Private candidates may apply by e-mailing [PostResultsServices@wjec.co.uk](mailto:PostResultsServices@wjec.co.uk) stating the candidate name, candidate number, centre name and number in any correspondence.

Please note that scripts to support teaching and learning will not be issued until after the closing date for reviews of marking.

## 3. Who undertakes the reviews of marking or moderation and how are they monitored?

WJEC appoints reviewers who are experienced senior examiners or moderators. WJEC maintains a register of interests for all its appointees which ensures that a reviewer does not have a conflict of interest when undertaking the reviewing role. The reviewer is a different individual to the original examiner or moderator.

All reviewers undertake compulsory training in their reviewing role. The training for reviews of marking includes watching and understanding the content of the reviewer training video, re-familiarisation with the question paper and mark scheme, reviewing the original standardisation conference training scripts provided to examiners, understanding 'reasonableness' and how it is applied in the review process, and reading and understanding the instructions and guidance document provided by WJEC. The training for reviews of moderation includes the reviewer familiarising themselves with the specification requirements and the instructions given at the initial moderators' standardisation conference, the mark scheme and the standards established at the standardisation conference and applied during the original moderation process and the instructions and guidance document.

WJEC carefully monitors all reviewers by:

- ensuring that all reviewers have been trained prior to starting any reviews of marking/moderation.
- scrutinising the number of mark changes that have been made and recording any issues that have been identified with the performance of examiners/moderators
- checking that decisions are aligned to the standard set at the original standardisation conference

- ensuring that all reviewers are adhering to the *Instructions for Reviewers* which meet the requirements of the regulatory conditions, particularly in relation to ensuring that only marking/moderation errors are corrected.

If, during the monitoring, WJEC identifies that a reviewer is not conducting their role correctly, we will take action to correct the situation. This may include re-training or re-allocating the reviews to another reviewer.

## 4. How is a review conducted?

The reviewer will be provided with a copy of a candidate's script or work that has been moderated, a copy of the mark scheme, the original marks and annotations. Ofqual's GCE and GCSE Qualification Level Guidance notes that 'anyone carrying out a review must consider the original mark given by a trained assessor' (i.e. the original examiner or moderator).

The role of the reviewer is to determine whether the original examiner/moderator has applied the mark scheme consistently, properly and fairly and whether the mark awarded was a reasonable mark. The review is not a re-mark or re-moderation exercise unless an error is identified with the original marking/moderation.

The reviewer will consider each task and the assessment as a whole and determine whether or not the original mark/grade could reasonably have been awarded. The reviewing process will:

- Determine if there has been an administrative error in the marking (e.g. a failure to mark part of the assessment or a calculation error)
- Determine whether or not the task is one where there is only a 'right' or 'wrong' mark or one which requires the exercise of academic judgement
- Determine if the correct mark has been given if there is only a 'right' or 'wrong' mark and correct the mark if an error has been made
- Determine, if academic judgement has been exercised, whether the marking contained any unreasonable exercise of academic judgement. Where this is found, the error will be corrected

If there is a change to the marks/grade, the reviewer will document the reasons. The reasons will be as follows:

- an administrative error
- the script was not marked fully in accordance with the mark scheme
- the original marking was unduly lenient
- the original marking was unduly harsh
- the original marking was both unduly lenient and harsh across different questions.

The reviewer will not change the marks unless there is a marking error.

## 5. What is a moderation or marking error?

A moderation error is defined as an outcome which could not reasonably have been arrived at given the candidate's work, the centre's marking of that work, the criteria against which candidates' performance is differentiated and WJEC's moderation procedures.

A marking error is defined as a mark which could not reasonably have been awarded to a candidate's responses when the mark scheme for the paper and other WJEC marking procedures are applied correctly.

A moderation or marking error can occur as a result of:

- an administrative error
- a failure to apply the mark scheme where a task has only a 'right' or 'wrong' answer
- an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement.

An error can occur, for example, if an examiner has not properly applied the mark scheme or has not marked a creditworthy response.

However, in many assessments, such as essays in English or History, there is not a 'right mark' and a 'wrong mark'. These types of assessments require examiners/moderators to use their academic judgement. Two trained examiners/moderators exercising their academic judgement reasonably and without making a mistake, could award different marks to the same candidate's answer and this is not considered to be an error.

In accordance with regulatory requirements, WJEC will always change a mark if there has been an error but not change one reasonable mark for an alternative mark in the case of a difference of academic judgement. Ofqual's Qualification Level Guidance states that 'the starting point for considering whether there has been an exercise of academic judgement is always the mark which is being challenged (and not any alternative mark which the Learner/Centre considers should have been awarded)'.

Examples of an unreasonable application of academic judgement include:

- marking which is unduly strict or lenient beyond the bounds of what might reasonably be expected of a trained examiner/moderator properly applying the mark scheme
- where part of an answer was not given a mark but where a trained and knowledgeable examiner/moderator acting reasonably should have given a mark
- where the marking of an answer suggests that the examiner/moderator had no rationale for his/her awarding of marks.

## 6. How should applications be made and will WJEC accept applications for reviews of marking or moderation directly from candidates?

WJEC prefers to work with centre staff who are aware of the expected standard of their candidates' work. Applications for all internal candidates must be made by a candidate's centre using WJEC's secure website. We would encourage private candidates to seek advice and apply through their entering centre but they may also apply directly by e-mailing our Post Results Service – [PostResultsServices@wjec.co.uk](mailto:PostResultsServices@wjec.co.uk) stating the candidate name, candidate number, centre name and number in any correspondence.

For internally assessed units we will only review the original sample submitted and only if marks have been adjusted. Therefore, we will only accept applications for reviews of moderation from centres, and not directly from candidates or their parents. There is a requirement on centres to have a procedure to enable candidates to appeal centre decisions prior to the submission of marks to WJEC.

In cases where centres have closed and are, therefore, no longer operating as a school/college when their former students receive their results, we will consider the best approach for affected students who need to apply for a review of marking.

## 7. Where will review decision letters be sent and what information will be included?

WJEC will report the outcome of a review of marking to a candidate's centre or directly to a private candidate. If there has been a marking error, we will report the change of mark, the change in grade (if applicable) and the reason. The reasons for a change in mark/grade are categorised as:

- an administrative error
- the script was not marked fully in accordance with the mark scheme
- the original marking was unduly lenient
- the original marking was unduly harsh

- the original marking was both unduly lenient and harsh across different questions.

In the case of a review of moderation, WJEC will provide the centre with a report on the review of moderation, regardless of whether the outcome is changed or remains the same.

## 8. Is there an appeals process?

If it is considered that an error remains following the review process, centres may submit an application for appeal against the outcome of a review of marking or moderation as outlined in the JCQ Appeals process [document](#) and WJEC's 'Appeals – A Guide for Centres', available [here](#). An appeal must be submitted within 30 calendar days of the review of marking or moderation outcome being issued. A private candidate may submit an appeal against the outcome of a review of marking by e-mailing our Compliance Team - [appeals@wjec.co.uk](mailto:appeals@wjec.co.uk) stating the candidate name, candidate number, centre name and number in any correspondence.

## 9. Will WJEC undertake further investigation if there is a concern about the marking of a cohort?

Throughout the review of marking period, WJEC monitors the review outcomes to assess whether or not there are any concerns which require further investigation. Our monitoring process includes identifying '**significant mark changes**'.

**Significant mark changes** are defined as either:

- half, or more, of the applications (which must comprise at least 10% of the centre's entire cohort) submitted for one specific component or unit changing by more than 5% of the total raw mark available for the specific assessment

**OR**

- a quarter, or more, of the applications (which must comprise at least 10% of the centre's entire cohort) submitted for one specific component or unit changing by more than 10% of the total raw mark available for the specific assessment.

If we identify significant mark changes on a specific component or unit, the centre will be advised by WJEC to submit further applications for reviews of marking **within five working days**, selecting all candidates of concern. However, the centre **must** receive consent from each candidate selected for a review of marking as marks can go up, down or remain the same.

Below are some examples to demonstrate situations where WJEC would and would not consider further investigative action.

**a) Centre 1**

Centre 1 entered 50 candidates for GCSE Drama, and submits applications for a review of marking for one paper, marked out of 80, for 5 candidates. One candidate's mark is changed from 50 to 53, as a result of the review of marking. The marks for the other four candidates remain unchanged.

*This is not considered for further investigation as there is no trend of significant mark changes. Although the centre has requested applications for at least 10% of the cohort, the marks have changed for only **one** candidate. Additionally, the mark has not changed **by more than 5% of the total raw mark available for the specific assessment.***

**b) Centre 2**

Centre 2 entered 200 candidates for GCSE English language and submits applications for a review of marking for one paper, marked out of 100, for 10 candidates.

The outcome of the review of marking is as follows:

One candidate's mark is changed from 70 to 76

One candidate's mark is changed from 50 to 43

One candidate's mark is changed from 80 to 83

Seven candidates' marks remain the same

*This is not considered for further investigation as there is no trend of significant mark changes. The centre has not requested applications for **at least 10% of the cohort**. There is evidence of two candidates' marks changing (in both an upward and a downward direction) **by more than 5% of the total raw mark for the paper**. However, the marks for one candidate have **moved by less than 5% of the total raw mark** and the remaining seven candidates' marks have remained the same.*

**c) Centre 3**

Centre 3 entered 20 candidates for GCE Biology and submits applications for a review of marking for one paper, marked out of 60, for 2 candidates.

The outcome of the review of marking is as follows:

One candidate's mark is changed from 40 to 44

One candidate's mark is changed from 50 to 43

*This is considered for further investigation. The centre has requested applications for **at least 10% of the cohort**. There is evidence of two candidates' marks changing (in both an upward and a downward direction) **by more than 5% of the total raw mark for the paper**. The centre is advised to submit further applications for a review of marking, selecting all candidates of concern, within five working days. The centre is reminded that consent is*

*required for each candidate submitted for a review of marking, as marks can go up, down or remain the same. Centres cannot choose to accept mark changes in an upward direction and refuse any mark changes in a downward direction.*

#### **d) Centre 4**

Centre 4 entered 40 candidates for GCE Geography and submits applications for a review of marking for two papers, each marked out of 80, for 5 candidates.

The outcome of the review is as follows:

##### Paper 1

One candidate's mark is changed from 60 to 50

One candidate's mark is changed from 55 to 43.

One candidate's mark is changed from 37 to 28.

The mark for two candidates remains unchanged.

##### Paper 2

All five candidates' marks remain unchanged.

*Paper 1 is considered for further investigation. The centre has requested applications **for at least 10% of the cohort**. There is evidence of three candidates' marks **changing by more than 10% of the total mark for the paper**. The centre is advised to submit further applications for a review of marking, selecting all candidates of concern, within five working days. The centre is reminded that consent is required for each candidate submitted for a review of marking, as marks can go up, down or remain the same. Centres cannot choose to accept mark changes in an upward direction and refuse any mark changes in a downward direction.*

*Paper 2 is not considered for further investigation as there is no trend of significant mark changes.*

Centres are not charged for any reviews of marking or moderation that lead to a candidate's overall qualification grade being changed.